

Serial No. 09/991,866

Docket No. LGE-0017

Amtd. Dated August 2, 2004

Reply to Office Action of February 2, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. By the Amendment, claims 1, 13, 14, and 16 are amended. No new matter has been introduced into the application. Support for the claims can be found in the original application, including original claims and the figures, for example, page 10, paragraph 45. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 13, 14, and 16-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Vaithilingam et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0159640 A1, hereinafter "Vaithilingam"). Because Vaithilingam does not disclose all the features of the claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a multimedia retrieval method that includes features of providing multimedia data having a multimedia descriptor including a designated set of descriptors; and determining a descriptor weight in accordance with a combination of descriptors for each descriptor of at least one subset of the designated set of descriptors, based upon a relation between at least one descriptor of the at least one subset and at least one descriptor of the designated set of descriptors that is not included in the at least one subset. Independent claims 14 and 16 include similar features in a varying scope. Applicants respectfully submit that such features are not disclosed by Vaithilingam.

Vaithilingam is directed to multimedia information retrieval that uses meta-descriptors along with descriptors. Vaithilingam describes a meta-descriptor generation method 110 that includes an extracting of descriptors from multimedia information step 111;

Serial No. 09/991,866

Docket No. LGE-0017

Amtd. Dated August 2, 2004

Reply to Office Action of February 2, 2004

a clustering of the multimedia information based on the descriptors step 112; an assigning of meta-descriptors to individual clusters step 113; and an attaching of the meta-descriptors to the multimedia information based on the clusters step 114. (See Fig. 2 of Vaithilingam). Applicants respectfully submit that although Vaithilingam discloses specific weights can be assigned to meta-descriptors assigned to a particular cluster in step 113, Vaithilingam does not describe the basis for determining weights among the meta-descriptors, much less weight determination of the assigned meta-descriptors vis-à-vis meta-descriptors not assigned to the cluster.

With respect to claim 13, independent claim 13 is directed to a multiweight generating method that includes features of obtaining a weight value representing an importance of each descriptor of a combination of descriptors included in a multimedia object; obtaining data corresponding to each of the descriptors that indicates what the descriptor intends to describe; generating multiweights for each descriptor from the obtained data according to the combination descriptors; and incorporating the multiweighted descriptors in a multimedia descriptor of multimedia data containing the multimedia object, wherein a weight of the multiweighted descriptor is automatically selected for the combination of descriptors upon execution of a multimedia descriptor query. Applicants respectfully submit that such features are not disclosed by Vaithilingam.

Vaithilingam, at pages 3 and 4, paragraph 0026, describes that weighting of the meta-descriptors can be accomplished automatically, manually, or in a "semi-automatic way with human interaction." Applicants respectfully submit, however, Vaithilingam does not

Serial No. 09/991,866

Docket No. LGE-0017

Amdt. Dated August 2, 2004

Reply to Office Action of February 2, 2004

disclose that a meta-descriptor can have multiple pre-assigned weights as a result of its inclusion in more than one cluster.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 13, 14, and 16 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

The Office Action rejects claims 7-12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Vaithilingam in view of Rivetieux de Varax (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,841, hereinafter "de Varax"). Because the references, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all the features of the claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claims 7-12, independent claim 7 is directed to a multimedia retrieval method that includes determining a descriptor weight in accordance with a viewpoint of a query for the multimedia retrieval. Applicants respectfully submit that such features are not disclosed or suggested by Vaithilingam, de Varax, or the combination thereof.

The Office Action, at page 9, acknowledges that Vaithilingam does not disclose or suggest determining a descriptor weight in accordance with a viewpoint of a query for the multimedia retrieval. However, the Office Action asserts that de Varax, at col. 4, lines 23-48 and col. 5, lines 17-50, "teaches in accordance with a viewpoint," and that it would have been obvious to modify Vaithilingam accordingly, because to do so would provide "for more accurate user customized results." Applicants respectfully disagree that de Varax, and the cited language thereof in particular, fail to cure the acknowledged deficiency of Vaithilingam.

Serial No. 09/991,866

Docket No. LGE-0017

Amdt. Dated August 2, 2004

Reply to Office Action of February 2, 2004

De Varax is directed to a method of indexing items to enable their retrieval, in which adaptive indexing is used to update keyword descriptors associated with the items. De Varax describes a process by which a keyword and its degree of relevance to any particular item is a function of the frequency with which the keyword is used in searching and browsing in conjunction with the item. (Col. 3, lines 16-32 and Fig. 4). De Varax describes keyword weight values as useful for evaluating "the importance of a keyword for a particular data item, and also to rank the results of a user query." (Col. 5, lines 56-58).

In contrast, the claimed invention is directed to a multimedia retrieval method in which the relevant descriptors of a multimedia object are weighted in accordance with a viewpoint of a query.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claim 7 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Serial No. 09/991,866

Docket No. LGE-0017

Amdt. Dated August 2, 2004

Reply to Office Action of February 2, 2004

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Garth D. Richmond, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carl R. Wesolowski
Registration No. 40,372
Garth D. Richmond
Registration No. 43,044

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703-766-3701 DYK:CRW:GDR/par
Date: August 2, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610